

IN THE DRAWINGS

**Proposed changes to Figs. 1 and 2 are submitted herewith,
with a Letter to the Official Draftsman.**

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Proposed changes to Figs. 1 and 2 are submitted herewith to overcome the objections thereto. Figs. 1 and 2 have been amended to include legends identifying them as related art.

Claims 1-6 have been canceled in favor of new claims 7-10. Support for the subject matter defined by claims 7-10 is provided in the original claims. The new claims have been drafted to avoid the issues underlying the indefiniteness rejections applied to claims 5 and 6.

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected, under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by Kojiro (JP 11-75248). Claim 2 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Kojiro in view of Minoru et al. (JP 11-261518). Claim 4 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Kojiro in view of Minoru and further in view of Ozluturk (US 6,373,830). Claims 5 and 6 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Kojiro in view of Minoru and further in view of Haartsen (US 5,491,837). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to new claims 7-10, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

New claim 7 recites features of original claim 1.

Applicants submit that Kojiro does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 7 for the following reasons.

Kojiro discloses arranging assigned frequency carriers differently between base station groups to prevent interference. Kojiro bears no relationship to the invention defined by claim 7, which relates to a time slot allocation method for single-frequency carrier operation.

Kojiro discloses selecting frequency carriers in the same order for base stations belonging to the same group and selecting frequency carriers in the opposite order for base stations of a different group (see Kojiro, paragraph 11). However, for one group, the frequency band of assigned frequency carriers differs between uplink channels and downlink channels. For example, referring to Kojiro's Fig. 5 with regard to the base stations belonging to group BSG1, the frequency carriers of the downlink channels are selected in frequency band FB1, while the frequency carriers for the uplink channels are selected from frequency band FB2. As a result, when cell arrangements are uneven, carriers cannot be allocated efficiently, as shown in Kojiro's Fig. 13.

By contrast to Kojiro's disclosure, in the invention defined by claim 7, as exemplified in the non-limiting embodiment shown in Fig. 5, both uplink channels and downlink channels are

allocated to time slots #1 to #14 in one radio communication frame, so that the channels are allocated efficiently regardless of cell arrangement.

In addition, Kojiro does not mention referring to the order of priority and discloses simply selecting carriers for the uplink/downlink channels from low frequency carriers and selecting carriers for the reverse path downlink/uplink channels from the high frequency carriers. By contrast, the invention defined by claim 7, as exemplified in the non-limiting embodiment shown in Fig. 7, allocates uplink channels in an order of priority and allocates downlink channels in the opposite order of priority from that used for the uplink channels.

Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Kojiro does not anticipate the subject matter defined by claim 7. Claim 9 similarly recites the above-mentioned features distinguishing apparatus claim 7 from Kojiro, but with respect to a method. Therefore, allowance of claims 7 and 9 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone

the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Date: January 18, 2006
JEL/DWW/att

Attorney Docket No. L9289.02121
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200